

MILITARY PERSONAL PROPERTY AND CLAIMS SYMPOSIUM

1 March 2000

Holiday Inn Hotel and Suites
625 First Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Military Chairperson

Ms. Phyllis Broz

Industry Chairperson

Mr. Bob Ewing

SUMMARY AGENDA

0830 hours - 0840 hours

Opening Comments

0840 hours - 1220 hours

Topics

TOPICS

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PROPOSERS</u>
121	USTRANSCOM Participation in M/I Process	American Moving and Storage Association United States Transportation Command
122	619 Forms and the DTR	American Moving and Storage Association United States Transportation Command
123	New 619	American Moving and Storage Association United States Transportation Command and Personal Property Systems Branch
124	“Advance Shipping Notice” – Code J Test	Household Goods Forwarders Association United States Transportation Command
125	Letter of Intent Forms	Household Goods Forwarders Association United States Transportation Command and Carrier Qualifications and Performance Branch
126	MTMC Move/Reorganization	American Moving and Storage Association Deputy Chief of Staff for Passenger and Personal Property

TOPICS (Continued)

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PROPONENTS</u>
127	Use of Adhesive Labels, Codes 2, 3, 4, 5, & T	Household Goods Forwarders Association Storage and POV Branch
128	Combining AORs	American Moving and Storage Association Domestic and International Rates Branch and Carrier Qualifications and Performance Branch
129	Item 508 – Crating Rates, International Solicitation	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Branch and Military Services
130	Excess Distance/Long Carry	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Branch
131	Increase Pickup and Delivery Rates	American Moving and Storage Association Domestic and International Rates Branch
132	Shipment Re-weighs	Household Goods Forwarders Association Domestic and International Rates Branch and Operations Branch
133	No ‘Date Signed’ on the 1840	American Moving and Storage Association Carrier Qualifications and Performance Branch and Military Services
134	Missed Pickup out of NTS	American Moving and Storage Association Carrier Qualifications and Performance Branch
135	DSC Realignment	American Moving and Storage Association Military Services and Operations Branch
136	Damage Noted on 1780 not 1840	American Moving and Storage Association Air Force
137	Scoring Based on Phone Call	American Moving and Storage Association Air Force

BRIEFING

Advanced Shipping Notice
Unaccompanied Baggage
Validation Test

United States Transportation Command

TOPICS (Continued)

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PROPONENTS</u>
138	DFAS-IN/Duplicate Request for GBLs	Household Goods Forwarders Association Defense Finance and Accounting Services and Personal Property Systems Branch
139	Navy Waivers Eliminated	American Moving and Storage Association Defense Finance and Accounting Services and Military Services
140	DFAS-IN/Document Retention for Audit and Archival	Household Goods Forwarders Association Defense Finance and Accounting Services General Services Administration
141	Payment to Agents when Carriers Cease Operations	American Moving and Storage Association Defense Finance and Accounting Services
142	EDI Invoicing	American Moving and Storage Association Defense Finance and Accounting Services
143	DFAS Setoffs	American Moving and Storage Association Defense Finance and Accounting Services
144	Alaska – EDI Shipments	Household Goods Forwarders Association Defense Finance and Accounting Services
145	Motorcycles – New Customs Regulations	Household Goods Forwarders Association Military Services
146	Points of Contact at Claims Offices	American Moving and Storage Association Military Claims Services
147	Conversion to NTS	American Moving and Storage Association Military Claims Services
148	Liability on NTS Conversion	American Moving and Storage Association Military Claims Services

ITEM: 121

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM)

SUBJECT: USTRANSCOM Participation in M/I Process

DISCUSSION: During the last M/I Symposium, the USTRANSCOM representative was asked about USTRANSCOM's using the M/I Symposium forum to discuss issues relevant and important to both sides prior to release and implementation. The representative indicated that USTRANSCOM viewed the M/I as a MTMC process and USTRANSCOM did not feel obligated to use it. Rather, USTRANSCOM's communication with the Industry would be through the use of Federal Register Notices.

The title of our meeting is the Military/Industry Symposium, not the MTMC/Industry Symposium. A number of people on the Industry side have worked to ensure that these meetings are a place where meaningful dialogues on current and future policy and operational issues can be held. It's disappointing that USTRANSCOM doesn't see any value in this type of face-to-face dialogue and would rather depend upon a formal written process that allows little opportunity for any give and take.

As we have seen with the implementation of the revised DD Forms 619 and 619-1, as well as the revised LOI format, this formal written communication process does not provide for timely notice of their existence or that revisions are contemplated or have been approved.

RECOMMENDATION: DOD has encouraged the development of a partnership type relationship between the Industry service providers and the DOD customers. The Military/Industry Symposium provides a unique opportunity for these partners to discuss a wide variety of issues at varying points in time. Many of these issues have real operational impacts even though they may be viewed as 'policy' issues.

Recommend that USTRANSCOM recognize the benefits of this unique opportunity and take advantage of this process to work more closely with its service providers.

RESPONSE: *Mr. Mike Cress, USTRANSCOM, concurred on the need for a close partnership with Industry; however, due to USTRANSCOM's small staff, coordinating responsibilities have been delegated to subordinate components.*

Industry would like to continue to use this forum in the future to discuss issues like the DTR IV.

*USTRANSCOM and Military Services will meet in April to discuss changes to DTR I.
USTRANSCOM willing to accept Industry's suggestions by 1 April.*

Mr. Cress' email address is michael.cress.hq.transcom.mil.

STATUS: Closed

ITEM: 122

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command

SUBJECT: 619 Forms and the DTR

DISCUSSION: At the last M/I, in September, the USTRANSCOM representative failed to notify Industry that the DTR Part IV had been issued six weeks prior to the M/I, on August 2. The first indication that the DTR Part IV had been approved was provided in late October, with an official copy provided to the Associations in December. We further learned that the DTR included a new version of the DD Form 619, dated October 1998. No mention of the new 619 form was made to Industry at any point within the first year of the form's existence.

Efforts to revise the DD Form 619 were the subject of several M/I items and other meetings in the early 1990s, but our records indicate that these discussions ceased in 1993 when Ms. Vivian Washington, the original point of contact, was assigned other duties in a reorganization of MTMC. We were therefore completely surprised to learn that a different version of the form was finalized and published five years later. As an example, one of the suggestions being considered was to combine the two forms.

DOD often espouses the virtues of partnering with Industry. Partnership requires some communication, and this type of form that is used on a regular basis by the Industry should have some Industry input in its design. Furthermore, once a new form is adopted, DOD needs to let us know and provide an adequate lead time to eliminate stocks of the old version and print copies of the new one prior to implementation.

RECOMMENDATION: Military and Industry representatives should work together to determine whether the new version of the DD Form 619 and 619-1 will meet everyone's needs, including whether the forms should be combined. If the new version is determined to be superior, movers should be permitted to phase in usage of the form after exhausting their existing supplies. Some military bases are requiring agents to start using the form on April 1, 2000, or some other arbitrary date. They should be advised to work

with agents to transition to whatever version makes the most sense. Finally, Industry should be advised if any other forms are being revised.

RESPONSE: Industry expressed concern as to why the loss and damage section is on the new DD Form 619. Mr. Mike Cress said USTRANSCOM will reexamine the 619 form and suggested Industry provide input on problems they are experiencing with the new 619.

Industry requested to continue the use of the old DD Form 619 until their stockpile is depleted. USTRANSCOM and MTMC will notify Industry and TOs with a response at a later date.

STATUS: Open

ITEM: 123

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command and
Personal Property Systems Branch

SUBJECT: New 619

DISCUSSION: There is no longer a 6 cube carton. It has been replaced with
an 8 cube carton. Why?

Also, on the SIT section there is a new block called “ordered
out” (13e). What is the purpose of this block?

If SIT delivery and re-weighs are supposed to be entered on the
619-1, why are they also listed on the 619?

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should respond to the questions and explain how these
forms are to be used.

RESPONSE: See Item 122 for response.

STATUS: Open

ITEM: 124

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command

SUBJECT: “Advance Shipping Notice” - Code J Test

DISCUSSION: The test of the Advance Shipping Notice on Code J baggage was implemented in early November 1999.

USTRANSCOM and MTMC have held meetings with a select group of carriers and port agents. Representatives of the associations have also been involved in some of those same meetings.

Industry recognizes and supports the original objectives of the test to better predict the flow of baggage into the outbound aerial ports and the more efficient coordination of military airlift capabilities. However, the Industry is concerned that the objectives of the program have evolved to now dictate to the carriers that they meet a required or guaranteed delivery date of the cargo to the outbound aerial port. Should this be the case, it will cause many substantial changes to the carrier’s traffic management procedure and greatly increase the costs of handling Code J.

RECOMMENDATION: USTRANSCOM/MTMC should schedule a detailed briefing on the “Advance Shipping Notice” test and provide an opportunity for all of Industry to attend.

Further, the objectives and any anticipated changes or enhancements to the test should be identified.

RESPONSE: USTRANSCOM provided a detailed briefing on the “Advance Shipping Notice”.

STATUS: Closed

ITEM: 125

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: United States Transportation Command and
Carrier Qualification Performance Branch

SUBJECT: Letter of Intent Forms

DISCUSSION: Since the release of the new Defense Transportation Regulations (DTR), there has been considerable confusion on the part of the Industry and the transportation offices on the submission of Letters of Intent.

It appears that the DTR has incorporated an old version of the LOI without the changes/improvements that have been implemented since the last re-issue of the DTR (PPTMR.)

1. The new LOI Form requires the carrier to submit multiple forms indicating agent representation for domestic versus international and household goods versus baggage.
2. The new LOI form requires a telex number be submitted in Block 5.

RECOMMENDATION: USTRANSCOM and MTMC should review the new form and amend the DTR.

A message should be sent to Industry and the carriers identifying the proper form to be used and clarifying the LOI filing process.

Industry recommends that one form be allowed when a carrier is designating one agent to provide both services.

RESPONSE:

Recommendation #1: *See Item 122 for response.*

Recommendation #2: *Mr. Hank Spieler, MTPP-HR, MTMC, provided the message below: MTPP-HQ 151722ZDEC99 SUBJ: Appendix AY, New LOI Form – (DTR) 4500.9-R.*

- 1. Current LOI will remain on file continuously until replaced with another LOI or is invalidated by the TO. The use of the new LOI Form will begin when LOI is replaced by the carrier.*
- 2. The new LOI located in Appendix AY will be grandfathered into the program. When changes occur to the information contained on the carrier's LOI on file, the carrier will use the new LOI Form (as shown in Appendix AY of DTR, Part IV) to execute the change.*
- 3. POCs are Mrs. Sylvia Walker (Carrier Qualifications), MTPP-HQ, MTMC, DSN 761-6393/703-681-6393/Email walkersylvia@mtmc.army.mil or Mr. Alex Moreno (Personal Property Rates), MTPP-HR, MTMC, DSN: 761-6190/703-681-6190/Email: morenoa@mtmc.army.mil.*

Recommendation #3: *Mr. Cress agreed to look into the recommendation of using one LOI Form when a carrier designates one agent.*

STATUS: *Open*

ITEM: 126

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Deputy Chief of Staff for Passenger and Personal Property

SUBJECT: MTMC Move/Reorganization

DISCUSSION: With MTMC moving to a different location this spring and the recent reorganization of MTMC staff, it is important that Industry be advised of the status of key points of contact within MTMC.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should provide information on its new mailing address, and when different groups of staffers will be moved to the new building. If phone or fax numbers will change, that information should also be provided.

RESPONSE: *Ms. Phyllis Broz, MTPP-D, MTMC, replied that the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Passenger and Personal Property is scheduled to move beginning April 21, 2000. The telephone and fax numbers will be provided at a later date. Our new mailing address will be:*

*Military Traffic Management Command
Hoffman Building II
Attn: MTPP
200 Stovall Street
Alexandria, VA 22332-5000*

MTMC will send a letter to all agencies and Industry on when to use the new mailing address. File data transfer for rate cycles at same FTP address.

STATUS: *Closed*

ITEM: 127

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Storage and POV Branch

SUBJECT: Use of Adhesive Labels, Codes 2, 3, 4, 5 & T

DISCUSSION: Industry would like for MTMC to consider and approve the use of adhesive labels in lieu of the old outdated stenciling method on Type 2 boxes for the above referenced codes.

In today's computer age, labels can be easily printed directly from automated databases. The use of labels is much more labor efficient and eliminates the possibility of information being corrupted in the stenciling process. Also, this change now better positions the Industry to more easily adopt bar coding practices in the future

RECOMMENDATION: Allow the use of adhesive labels instead of stenciling on Type 2 boxes.

RESPONSE: *Mr. Charlie Helfrich, MTPP-HP, MTMC, replied that containers are subject to rough handling during transit, moving through carriers warehouse and water port warehouse facilities for consolidation and distribution. Paper labels have a tendency to deteriorate. Furthermore, shipments imported to CONUS are subject to NTS for indefinite periods of time, which could damage labels increasing the risk of loss of the shipment due to label becoming unreadable.*

In order for MTMC to consider this recommendation, we require the following industry specifics:

- *Type of label (paper, cardboard, etc.) to be used*
- *Size of label*
- *Type of glue best suited for use in diverse environmental settings*
- *How well label materials react to heat/cold and moisture*

Industry will review MTMC's recommendations and provide the requested information.

STATUS: *Open*

ITEM: 128

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Branch and
Carrier Qualifications and Performance Branch

SUBJECT: Combining AORs

DISCUSSION: Recently, MTMC announced that Wright Patterson AFB, OH would be absorbing the areas of responsibility of the former 88th TRNS offices in Cleveland and Indianapolis. This change was to be effective 5/1/00, because MTMC cannot change AORs in the middle of a rate cycle. MTMC solicited rates for all three areas for the current DW99 cycle. However, Wright Patterson AFB combined all 3 areas into one for TQAP purposes effective 9/20/99 without advising carriers that it was their intent to do so.

In addition, by combining the scores, they "averaged" averages together, meaning that a carrier who had shipments graded at 100 for one base and an administrative 90 at another base, got a 95 average for the new combined area. In other cases, there did not seem to be any mathematical rhyme or reason as to how the scores were combined.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should always advise the Industry of the effective dates of these changeovers, which have a dramatic impact on expected bookings from a military installation, particularly if TQAP scores are combined. Furthermore, if MTMC advises of a consolidation date (in this case 5/1/00), they should not be allowed to change that date after rates have been solicited and TQAP scores have been determined for a given cycle. Carriers and their agents deserve to know about these changes in advance so that they can plan for them.

Additionally, proper procedures should be followed for combining TQAP scores.

Also, it would also be easier for some carriers to be able to use different agents as the point of contact in each of the zones, rather than being forced to resubmit LOIs listing the same primary agent for all three zones.

RESPONSE:

Recommendation #1:

Mr. Hank Spieler, MTPP-HR, MTMC, concurred with recommendation.

Recommendation #2:

Mr. Hank Spieler, MTPP-HR, MTMC, sent a message out in Aug 99. The message will be retransmitted within 30 days.

Recommendation #3:

Mr. George McDonald, MTPP-HQ, MTMC, replied that the PPSO are following the procedures that are in the DTR 4.

STATUS: Closed

ITEM: 129

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Branch and
Military Services

SUBJECT: Item 508 - Crating Rates, International Solicitation

DISCUSSION: This is an issue that will continue to arise until action or
acceptable justification for no action is provided to Industry.

There is no reason why crating rates in the International
Solicitation should not reflect the same or near those rates
allowed in the Domestic Program. The same material and
labor is utilized by the agents in both instances.

The cost of labor and, particularly, material continue to
increase, yet the rates do not.

The Domestic Personal Property Solicitation Item for crating of
mirrors, paintings, marble, etc., ranges from \$4.65 to \$6.90 per
cubic foot depending on the geographical area.

RECOMMENDATION: Industry requests that the rates for crating in the International
Solicitation be brought in line with the Domestic Solicitation.

We suggest that MTMC approve a rate of \$5.75 per cubic foot
(\$25.00 minimum) for internal crating and \$6.55 per cubic foot
(no minimum) for external crates.

RESPONSE: *Mr. Hank Spieler, MTPP-HR, MTMC, recognized that the price of lumber has
increased and will research the issue and include the cost of labor and the use of lumber for
internal crating. Research progress report will be published before the next M/I Symposium in
August 2000.*

STATUS: *Open*

ITEM: 130

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Branch

SUBJECT: Excess Distance/Long Carry Charges

DISCUSSION: Excess distance and long carry charges should be addressed in the International Solicitation in addition to that currently provided for in the mini-storage applications.

These items are provided for in the tariff and are recognized as acceptable commercial practice and chargeable items by the Industry's other national accounts which ship internationally.

RECOMMENDATION: Current line items for excess distances and long carries, as well as, relating rates allowed in the MTMC Domestic Solicitation should be incorporated into the ITGBL Solicitation.

RESPONSE: *Mr. Hank Spieler, MTPP-HR, MTMC, replied that excess distance and long carries are part of the single factor rate. Anything in excess of 75ft (will) be paid as labor. Identify distance, long carries, and stair carries in the solicitation.*

MTMC agreed to put the line items in the solicitation and review stair carries.

STATUS: *Open*

ITEM: 131

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Branch

SUBJECT: Increase Pickup and Delivery (P/D) Rates

DISCUSSION: In each of the other accessorial rate increases since 1983, MTMC has increased the P/D rates along with the other accessories. However, in 1999, P/D rates were not increased by 10%.

P/D rates generally compensate warehousemen who are making a delivery of a shipment out of storage at destination to residence. Since the rates are bid at origin, carriers do not discuss their rates with each possible destination agent, especially those in areas with few shipments. Thus the P/D service provider has no control over the linehaul percentage filed by the carrier. A periodic adjustment for inflationary costs is their only ability to continue to do business in an environment when their costs continue to rise each year. Unfortunately, the P/D rates have been frozen since 1995.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should make a fair and reasonable increase in the P/D rates of 10% at the earliest possible time.

RESPONSE: *Mr. Hank Spieler, MTPP-HR, MTMC, is currently working this issue and will coordinate with the Military Services to provide a response by mid-April 2000.*

STATUS: *Open*

ITEM: 132

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Domestic and International Rates Branch and Operations Branch

SUBJECT: Shipment Reweighs

DISCUSSION: The Industry cannot understand why MTMC would have two different procedures and rates for handling the reweigh of shipments. This dual policy makes it very confusing for the agents who perform the service on behalf of the carriers.

RECOMMENDATION: The ITGBL Solicitation should be amended to reflect the same rate (\$50.00 per reweigh) in the Domestic Solicitation.

Further, the weight derived by the reweigh should be the applicable rate weight.

RESPONSE: Mr. Hank Spieler, MTPP-HR, MTMC, will coordinate with the Pacific area staff (Korea) and publish findings by next M/I and will consider publishing the rate in the next winter cycle.

STATUS: Closed

ITEM: 133

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualification and Performance Branch and Military Services

SUBJECT: No 'Date Signed' on the DD Form 1840

DISCUSSION: Recently, some shipments have been scored at 60 for the Date Signed section on the DD Form 1840 not being filled out. These shipments were placed into SIT prior to the RDD.

RECOMMENDATION: We request that a message be sent to all transportation offices advising that the date a shipment delivers into SIT is the date used to determine whether a carrier should be awarded points for an on-time delivery and that the date the DD Form 1840 was signed is not relevant in measuring on-time delivery. Also, we'd like to point out that the lack of a date on an 1840 does not in any way affect the damage, or lack of damage, that is listed on the 1840 as long as the 1840 has been signed by the property owner.

RESPONSE: Mr. George McDonald, MTPP-HQ, MTMC, replied that a message will be sent to the field advising TOs not to reduce shipment scores because "Date Signed", blocks, 14.f and 15.f have not been completed on the DD Form 1840 within 30 days. Failure of a carrier/agent to properly complete documentation is a Tender of Service violation. TOs should issue letter of warning.

STATUS: Open

ITEM: 134

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Carrier Qualifications and Performance Branch

SUBJECT: Missed Pickup out of NTS

DISCUSSION: Some shipments have been scored for missing the pick up date when the shipment comes out of NTS at the carrier's own agent's warehouse. Specifically, if a shipment is in NTS and is booked with a code 1 interstate carrier and the NTS contractor is also serving as the origin agent for the carrier, the carrier should be able to instruct the agent to hold the shipment at that facility until linehaul equipment can be assigned. Since the origin location of the shipment is not the member's residence, they are not inconvenienced by this action as long as the delivery is made on time. However, the shipping office sometimes deems this a violation of the on-time pickup requirements because they were not notified and had not agreed to a pickup date change with the carrier and the NTS warehouseman.

The shipment remaining at the facility of the carrier's agent is simply a change in the status of the shipment from NTS to carrier 'pick and hold' and carrier liability as an interstate shipment rather than NTS. When the NTS warehouse is the same as the carrier's agent facility there isn't inconvenience to any party. The service member certainly is not affected, so the carrier shouldn't have 20 points deducted for missing the pickup. This is an internal procedure and doesn't warrant notification of the TO and shouldn't qualify as missing the pick up date.

RECOMMENDATION: We'd like to see MTMC advise TOs that the penalty for missing an on-time pickup should not apply when a shipment is taken from a carrier's agent's own NTS facility.

RESPONSE: *Mr. George McDonald, MTPP-HQ, MTMC, replied that TOs will be advised to review TQAP, Part C.4. Performance Factors, a.(2) which covers this situation. Carriers/agents and TOs must coordinate approval(s) in advance of the pickup date shown on the GBL. If a later date for pickup of shipment from NTS is not coordinated with the TO and the pickup is missed, the TO will score the shipment as missing the pickup.*

If shipment is at origin, in the agents' own warehouse, then no prior NTS approval is necessary.

STATUS: *Closed*

ITEM: 135

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Services and Operations Branch

SUBJECT: Deployment Support Command (DSC) Realignment

DISCUSSION: With limited advance notice to the Industry, MTMC transferred all personal property functions from the DSC at Fort Eustis to HQMTMC. The DSC performed many useful operational functions that we hope will be continued at HQ.

For example, during the recent snow storms on the east coast, a number of military installations closed. This meant that there was no one available for emergency clearance of DOD shipments on the east coast. The DSC had disbanded their personal property function, HQMTMC was closed, RSMO Ft. Monmouth was closed, and so were most Air Force bases. Carriers tried to get some help from Atlanta RSMO, but because it was out of their area, they were obviously reluctant to provide support. Carriers need points of contact for these types of situations, along with alternates to use in case HQMTMC is closed. The individual service members are the ones who suffer when we are unable to contact them to deliver a shipment.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should provide a list of contacts for those offices/employees assuming the duties previously filled by DSC, including addresses, phone numbers, fax numbers, and email addresses. In addition, alternate emergency contacts should be provided in a different geographic location in case of weather problems (or other problems while HQMTMC is itself relocating) for example.

RESPONSES:

RECOMMENDATION #1:

Russ Daly, MTPP-HO, MTMC, replied that effective 18 Jan 00, all personal property functions performed at Deployment Support Command transferred to HQ MTMC, DCSPPP, Personal Property Division (MTPP-H). Operational issues regarding day-to-day activities, i.e., service failures, shipment tracing, property being held by agents/carriers, etc., are now handled by the Operations Team (MTPP-HO). Carrier performance issues, i.e., appeals, claims and review boards are now the responsibility of our Quality and Performance Team (MTPP-HQ). Our POV and Storage Team (MTPP-HP) now handles all issues regarding processing of vehicles under the Global POV Contract.

*Russ Daly, MTPP-HO, CML 703-428-3039, FAX 703-428-3389, email: dalyr@mtmc.army.mil
George McDonald, MTPP-HQ, CML 703-428-3001, FAX 703-428-3388,
email: mcdonaldg@mtmc.army.mil
Charles Helfrich, MTPP-HP, CML 703-428-2996, FAX 703-428-3388, email:
helfichc@mtmc.army.mil*

RECOMMENDATION #2:

Military Services agreed to coordinate a joint message to the field on what the procedures are if a carrier has a problem with a shipment clearance, to include holiday closures, inclement weather, and bases closures.

STATUS: Closed

ITEM: 136

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Air Force

SUBJECT: Damage Noted on DD Form 1780 not 1840

DISCUSSION: At Wright-Patterson AFB, inspectors are noting damage on their DD Forms 1780 reports at the time of delivery, but the 1840 and 1840R forms do not have damage noted. The carriers are then being graded for TQAP purposes on the 1780 damage rather than the 1840 information. Some of the dollar amounts noted are the "standard" of \$25.

RECOMMENDATION: Inspectors should be advised to point out damage to the service member and the carrier for them to note on the DD Form 1840 if deemed appropriate by the member, rather than noting damage directly on the 1780 if it is not reported using the proper 1840 form.

RESPONSE: MSgt John Jelkes, Air Force, will contact Wright-Patterson AFB to resolve the issue.

STATUS: Closed

ITEM: 137

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Air Force

SUBJECT: Scoring Based on Phone Call

DISCUSSION: At Altus AFB, OK, the Quality Control (QC) section is calling the service member concerning damage and customer satisfaction (which in itself is a good practice), but is then using this phone call to score the shipment even if there is no paper documentation of any problems with the move.

While Industry supports efforts to revamp the TQAP system to make it more responsive to the service member's satisfaction, until the system is changed, all carriers need to be scored following the rules that exist. If QC determines through this phone call that there is loss or damage that was not noted on the DD Form 1840, they should encourage the service member to note it on an 1840R and then use that form for scoring purposes. This protects the service member's legal rights with respect to a possible claim, and it ensures that carriers have written documentation supporting their TQAP score.

RECOMMENDATION: Carriers should be scored in compliance with the existing TQAP rules.

RESPONSE: *Item 137 was withdrawn.*

STATUS: *Closed*

ITEM: 138

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Defense Finance and Accounting Services and
Personal Property Systems Branch

SUBJECT: DFAS-IN/Duplicate Request for GBLs

DISCUSSION: Over the past several months, DFAS-IN has contacted carriers and requested that they provide a second or duplicate copy of the GBL.

It is not unusual for a carrier to be sent a request to provide DFAS-IN with 50 or more GBLs at a time. This places considerable administrative burden on the carrier and he is coerced to comply with the request in order not to delay receipt of payment.

Apparently, some transportation offices overseas do not have the ability to transmit the GBL information directly to DFAS for match up with the carriers invoice submission.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC should consult with DFAS-IN to determine which overseas locations do not have the ability to transmit the GBL information.

Action should be taken to eliminate this burden from the carrier.

RESPONSE: *Mr. James Burnett, DFAS-IN, The Deputy Director for Transportation Payments, will develop a listing of overseas sites that we have to request bills for in order to pay carriers in a timely manner. DFAS can provide this list to MTMC, after a short developmental period, if they deem it necessary. DFAS requests hard copy documents when they feel that it is the most expeditious way to get the invoice paid, but their goal is to pay utilizing electronic records.*

DFAS will look at Industry's concerns about invoices being purged, but did not have any knowledge of this process.

Mr. Lee Strong, MTMC, will look into why information is not feeding through TOPS to DFAS, and why the appropriations codes are absent in Korea.

STATUS: *Open*

ITEM: 139

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Defense Finance and Accounting Services and
Military Services

SUBJECT: Navy Waivers Eliminated

DISCUSSION: DFAS-Norfolk advised Industry on November 19, 1999 that they would not accept any more SIT waivers effective December 1, 1999. This decision applies to Navy shipments. This was not sufficient notice of the change, especially with the Thanksgiving holiday week in the middle. Decisions such as this change have significant impact on carriers' and agents' operations and should be given with sufficient lead time to plan for the change.

As we stated when DFAS-Indianapolis took a similar step, we oppose the blanket elimination of waivers. We believe that the Military Services and their customers realize the impact of the elimination of waivers on customer service, especially in the summer months, and are disappointed that DOD is letting the finance offices make this type of quality of life decision.

RECOMMENDATION: All of the DFAS offices should reverse their decision on waivers.

DOD entities should make every effort to provide sufficient advance notice of major decisions that will have an impact on the moving and storage industry.

The Coast Guard and Marine Corps finance offices should indicate what their policies are regarding waivers and if any change is expected to those policies.

RESPONSE: *Mr. James Burnett, DFAS-IN, replied that the General Services Administration published proposed rules (Federal Register/Vol. 65, No. 35/Tuesday, Feb. 22, 2000, and 41 CFR 101-41 and 102-118) which allow the paying agency to pay only the Transportation Service Provider with whom it has a contract. It further stipulates that Block 1 of the SF 1103 and Block 1 of the SF 1203 lists the TSP with whom the Government has a contract. Recommend this issue be tabled until the GSA rules are finalized.*

STATUS: *Open*

ITEM: 140

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Defense Finance and Accounting Services and
General Services Administration

SUBJECT: DFAS-IN/Document Retention for Audit and Archival

DISCUSSION: Industry has recently been advised that DFAS Indianapolis has changed/amended the process for the audit and retention of documentation submitted in support of billings on SF 1113s. The changes are to have been effective February 1, 2000.

There have been several messages in this regard which have led to confusion as to the full extent of the changes. One message indicates that the changes in procedure will eliminate the need for GSA to request documentation for post -payment auditing.

RECOMMENDATION: DFAS-IN should provide a briefing to Industry and the Military Services outlining in detail the changes and impact on the paper and EDI billing processes.

Confirmation should be sought from GSA as to the extent the changes will have on their audit processes, pre and post.

RESPONSE: *Mr. James Burnett, DFAS-IN, replied that based upon input from several carriers, the GSA post payment auditors were most frequently requesting the DOD 619 and DOD 619-1 to support billings. The 619 and 619-1 were estimated to constitute 85 – 95% of the documents requested. Given Industry support we have changed our process to archive the documents. This change was publicized as below:*

PERSONAL PROPERTY DOCUMENT RETENTION CHANGE

Effective February 1, 2000, DFAS-Indianapolis will begin retaining and archiving copies of the DD 619 and DD 619-1 included with paper billing packets. These paper documents will be retained in the payment packets provided to the GSA post payment auditors. We are also changing the billing instructions requiring inclusion of these documents with all paper billings. There is no change to requirements for EDI commerce.

IMPACT OF CHANGES: *This change will not make any change to EDI processing. It should not increase processing time for paying paper invoices. It should decrease the number of documents requested by GSA auditors (both pre and post payment), but will not eliminate the occasional request for other supporting documents.*

Mr. James Fitzgerald, GSA, received notification from Mr. James Burnett of DFAS that effective 2/1/2000 DFAS-IN would begin retaining the DD 619 and DD 619-1 with the paper billing packets to forward to this office for audit.

Receipt of these documents with the paid billings will stop the large volume of document requests that the carriers receive, as the documentation will be available to the auditors at the time of the post payment audit. After the DFAS change in procedure, we will request documentation only in cases where the attachments are not received from DFAS-IN or where additional information is required for clarification.

Information requests will continue for several months to handle billings that are in the audit pipeline for the period proceeding the 2/1/00 payment date.

Prepayment audits are the responsibility of the paying office, and you must check with DFAS-IN to address how this change will effect that process.

Payment and billing instructions are in the process of being rewritten. No change to EDI's proposal unless GSA makes it. Prepayment audits begin in June 2000, if billing submitted electronically.

STATUS: Closed

ITEM: 141

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Defense Finance and Accounting Services

SUBJECT: Payment to Agents when Carriers Cease Operations

DISCUSSION: The recent decision by A Olympic Forwarders and Emerald City International to cease operations has left numerous service providers stranded with significant sums of money owed to them. On the domestic side, Global Van Lines' filing for bankruptcy has caused similar problems. These situations have been made significantly worse by DFAS' refusal to accept waivers. In previous cases, warehousemen were able to bill the Government directly for services rendered by them, rather than being forced to stand in line behind all other creditors for payment.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC and DFAS need to work out a process for service providers to be paid when a DOD approved carrier that was originally tendered the shipment no longer is in business. If the carrier has not already been paid for storage charges, the warehouse should be permitted to bill for that storage and collect the money that is rightfully theirs.

RESPONSE: Mr. James Burnett, DFAS-IN, replied that the proposed changes to 41 CFR 101-41 and 102-118, requiring the paying agency to pay only the service provider, impacts this item. Recommend this issue be tabled in light of the pending changes to regulatory guidance.

DFAS will pay agents on a case-by-case basis.

STATUS: Open

ITEM: 142

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Defense Finance and Accounting Services

SUBJECT: EDI Invoicing

DISCUSSION: We are having some of our EDI invoices we send to DFAS-IN rejected because, according to DFAS-IN, the domestic transportation office is not online with TOPS and hasn't sent an electronic record of the GBL to their system. To our knowledge, all domestic installations were supposed to be online with TOPS. That capability was supposed to feed the information to DFAS-IN's system.

RECOMMENDATION: MTMC or DFAS-IN should provide Industry with a list of all installations, CONUS and OCONUS, that are not online with TOPS and whose shipments cannot be invoiced via EDI.

RESPONSE: *Mr. James Burnett, DFAS-IN, replied that the Deputy Director for Transportation Payments will develop a listing of domestic shipping sites that we have to request bills for in order to pay carriers in a timely manner. DFAS can provide this list to MTMC, after a short developmental period, if they deem necessary.*

If the GBL in question appears to be printed from a laser printer and not from a typewriter, the shipment was generated from TOPS. GBLs that are done on a typewriter are not in the TOPS system and should not be billed via EDI. TOPS had some problems in the past sending the shipment data (GBL data) to MTMC. We have been informed that MTMC has identified the problem and is currently working to resolve the issue.

Mr. Lee Strong, MTPP-SH, MTMC, stated that all domestic installations are online with TOPS but some embassies and waterports are not on line.

The POCs at DFAS for this issue are Mr. Randy Jones, 317-510-2478 or Mr. Dennis Richey, 317-510-2943.

STATUS: Open

ITEM: 143

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Defense Finance and Accounting Services

SUBJECT: DFAS Setoffs

DISCUSSION: A number of carriers have just received a ton of setoffs all at once. Based on our research, it appears that it is because of DFAS processing the setoff requests in a large batch, rather than the Services providing the information all at the same time.

Also, many of the offsets have no explanation, just the letters GSA appear. About half are claims and half are unidentifiable.

RECOMMENDATION: DFAS should make an effort to space out offsets if they have a year or two worth of offsets to do. If two years' worth of claims are all offset at the same time in the middle of the winter slow season, the impact on carriers' revenue stream is dramatic.

RESPONSE: Mr. James Burnett, DFAS-IN, stated most offsets to carrier revenue are completed at the request of other Governmental organizations. Those organizations do not document to DFAS-IN why they are having the offset made. DFAS-IN developed the "Advice of Pay (AOP)" in part to help explain why offsets were taken against revenue. The AOP contains an abbreviation of the organization that requested the offset. Those abbreviations are:

<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Tel. No. for Info</i>
<i>GSA</i>	<i>General Services Admin.</i>	<i>202-501-3334, 3978, 0981</i>
<i>AFJAG</i>	<i>AF Legal Service Admin.</i>	<i>202-767-1585</i>
<i>AJAG</i>	<i>Army Claims Service</i>	<i>301-677-7009 X452</i>
<i>HHG</i>	<i>Army Claims Service</i>	<i>301-677-7009</i>
<i>JPPSO</i>	<i>AF JPPSO-San Antonio</i>	<i>210-321-4229</i>
<i>OVPAY & ANY OTHERS</i>	<i>DFAS-IN Customer Svc.</i>	<i>1-888-GBLS Pay #1 (1-888-425-7729)</i>

We realize that offsets are not input at a constant rate. This is in part due to this work being a lower priority than bill payment and we have aligned resources accordingly. We do recognize the inconvenience this may create and will try to level our activities.

STATUS: Closed

ITEM: 144

PROPONENT: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Defense Finance and Accounting Services

SUBJECT: Alaska - EDI Shipments

DISCUSSION: Recently DFAS-IN unofficially advised that the carriers will be required to advise in their EDI billings whether Alaska shipments moved by Water versus Land and, if so, what is the Ocean Bill of Lading Number.

This change has never been discussed with the EDI Committee. Further, this requires a considerable and expensive re-write to the carrier's billing software programs.

RECOMMENDATION: DFAS-IN should inform the carriers officially of this change and work with Industry to determine if an easier method can be utilized to obtain the required information, and/or determine whether the information is that crucial to collect.

RESPONSE: Mr. James Burnett, DFAS-IN, stated the DOD Electronic Data Interchange convention for Transaction Set 859, Generic Freight Invoice remains unchanged since April 1993. The REF segment information is needed to insure that the payment will be made for water miles, not land miles. Without this information on the EDI invoice incorrect payments will occur.

The EDI team at DFAS-IN, Deputy Director for Transportation Payments will surface the issue through the EDI Committee for input and work with Industry to determine if there is an easier method to obtain the critical information.

STATUS: Closed

ITEM: 145

PROPOSER: Household Goods Forwarders Association

STAFF PROPOSER: Military Services

SUBJECT: Motorcycles - New Customs Regulations

DISCUSSION: Industry has recently been informed that the US Customs Service intends to begin random X-Rays of containers moving outbound through US ports for motorcycles. It appears that Customs is now extending the regulations implemented under Title IV of the "Anti Car Theft Act of 1997" to all used self-propelled vehicles (definition including motorcycles.)

Through experience the past year and a half, Industry is aware of the impact these regulations have had on the exportation of privately owned vehicles; i.e., delays, missed vessels, seizures, lost documentation, etc..

Considering the high volume of motorcycles shipped with military personal effects, these new policies on the part of US Customs potentially will mean many of the same problems for military shipments as those encountered on commercial shipments.

RECOMMENDATION: If it has not already done so, DOD/MTMC should arrange with US Customs to be granted exemptions to these regulations for motorcycles exported on behalf of Military Service Members moving under Military Orders.

RESPONSE: *USTRANSCOM was not aware of the problem but will review this issue. Industry will identify who is having this problem and pass information to USTRANSCOM.*

STATUS: *Open*

ITEM: 146

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Services

SUBJECT: Points of Contact at Claims Offices

DISCUSSION: The Base Claims Offices need to include their telephone and fax numbers on any and all correspondence directed to the van lines etc. I think you will find that all carriers do this. With area code changes and the normal changes of phone numbers at the base, it would make it easier for adjusters to call the claims offices and/or fax information.

Also, it needs to be brought to the carriers' attention when claims offices are consolidated or moved to a different location so we can change our records and mail correspondence to the correct location.

RECOMMENDATION: The Military Claims Services should remind their local base claims offices to put their phone #'s and fax #'s on their letters, and provide the associations with copies of any current directories of the field offices that the HQ might have. If email addresses are available, they would also be very helpful, especially for overseas claims offices.

RESPONSE: *The Military Claims Services will remind their local base claims offices to put their phone and fax numbers on all correspondence. If a carrier does not have a number to the local base claims office, they should contact the Service headquarters. If a carrier continues to have a problem with a specific base, the carrier should notify the Service headquarters and they will handle each situation on a case-by-case basis.*

STATUS: Closed

ITEM: 147

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Services

SUBJECT: Conversion to NTS

DISCUSSION: Item 316 of the RSD-6 states, "When a shipment is not removed from SIT by the expiration of the 180th day, or at the end of the extended SIT period authorized by the PPSO, liability as a carrier shall terminate at midnight of the last day of the SIT period, the through GBL character of the shipment shall cease, the warehouse shall be considered the final destination point of the shipment, the warehouseman shall become agent for the shipper, and the shipment then becomes subject to the rules, regulations, charges and liability of the warehouseman."

This issue has been raised in the past, where the PPSO does not take any action to extend the SIT on a shipment on or before the 180th day, and no extension notice is provided to the carrier or its agent on or before the 180th day, but at some point well past the 180th day, the PPSO "declares" that SIT had been extended and produces a DD1857 prepared after the 180th day.

RECOMMENDATION: This retroactive authorization should not be allowed and the carrier and its agent should be entitled to know unequivocally what the nature is of shipments in storage and whether they are carrier liability or warehouseman liability. The PPSO should not be able to declare SIT "after the fact." DTR Part IV should be amended to specifically address the retroactive provision.

RESPONSE: *MTMC will clarify Item 316 and restaff it with the Military Services.*

STATUS: *Open*

ITEM: 148

PROPONENT: American Moving and Storage Association

STAFF PROPONENT: Military Claims Services

SUBJECT: Liability on Sit Expiration

DISCUSSION: When SIT expires, either at midnight on the 180th day or at the end of any properly extended SIT period, or when the shipment converts to permanent storage at either member or Government expense, DOHA has recently ruled (Settlement Decision 99092918) that the GBL carrier must have taken a rider against the warehouse at the time of SIT expiration. There is no such obligation in any of the regulations, the RSD-6 or the DTR. In fact, the SIT warehouse is the one who takes a rider against the carrier when the shipment is first placed into SIT. At the time of conversion, the carrier has already established the condition of the goods being converted to permanent storage by the original inventory and any rider taken at the time the goods were placed into SIT. This DOHA decision is in error procedurally.

RECOMMENDATION: We request that the claims services review the matter to acknowledge the warehouseman's legal liability as last handler as opposed to the carrier's liability.

RESPONSE: MTMC will review their regulations and provide a response to Industry..

STATUS: Open

Added Item

Industry added an item about the time frame for rate cycles and asked is it reasonable to invoke new liability without opportunity to change their rates?

Mr. Hank Spieler stated that MTMC will send advance copies of the rate filing cycles to the associations.